



Technological University Dublin
ARROW@TU Dublin

Articles

School of Marketing

1988-01-01

Involved Consumers and Advertising Involvement

Katrina Lawlor

Technological University Dublin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/buschmarart>

 Part of the [Marketing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lawlor, K.: Involved consumers and advertising involvement. Irish Marketing Review, Vol. 3, 1988, pg. 86-96.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Marketing at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)



INVOLVED CONSUMERS AND ADVERTISING INVOLVEMENT

Katriona Lawlor, College of Marketing and Design,
Dublin Institute of Technology

Summary

The question of consumer involvement has at times taken on the appearance of a theoretical quagmire. The proliferation of definitions apart, this confusion has been exacerbated by the failure to distinguish adequately between advertising and consumer involvement. The research outlined in this article attempts to probe the possible relationship between these two discrete entities.

It takes as its starting point Kassarian's postulate of a generalised trait of purchasing involvement. This novel and as yet untested trait in consumers is cross tabulated with the levels of advertising involvement exhibited by these same consumers in a series of paint advertisements broadcast on Irish national television. A thought verbalisation methodology is employed to gauge this advertising involvement among members of an Irish countrywide consumer panel. The findings which emerge are as seminal to the applicability of such a thought verbalisation methodology as they are to the relationship between consumer and advertising involvement.

Consumer and advertising involvement are concerned with the relationship between attitude and behaviour. The fundamental assumption of high involvement is that the individual is first of all active in processing information, learning, and forming attitudes by evaluating attributes and alternative products, or by consciously evaluating ads and then behaving. Low involvement theorists question this assumption and propose instead that individuals learn passively and may not be concerned with choice processes; people learn by perceiving ads, behave and only then form attitudes.¹ Although the relationship between attitude and behaviour is the same for consumer and advertising involvement, this does not mean that consumers, highly involved with a product or product category, will necessarily be highly involved with ads for that product category.

The main objective of this paper is to ascertain the extent to which Kassarian's generalised personality trait of "being involved in purchasing" affects the way consumers evaluate advertisements.² If personality factors do affect evaluation of ads this means that advertising strategies would have to be devised to cater for the three personality groupings. The first part of this paper is concerned with a literature review on consumer and advertising involvement. Consumer involvement is examined in terms of the various definitions and concepts which highlight the number of different variables in involvement. This is followed by an explanation of the research methodology used and then by analysis and discussion of the results of the research.

General Definition

The definition of involvement given by Rothschild is perhaps the most acceptable general definition; "involvement is an observable state of motivation, arousal or interest. It is evoked by a particular stimulus or situation and has drive properties. Its consequences are types of searching, information processing and decision making".³ This is a cognitively based definition which implies direction and motivation. Other definitions are more specific, and tend to concentrate on a particular area of involvement.

The first specific area is product involvement.^{4,5,6} Bloch's definition is typical of product involvement. "Product involvement is defined as an un-observable state reflecting the amount of interest, arousal or emotional attachment evoked by the product in a particular individual".⁷ Individuals, highly involved with a product, will consciously evaluate attributes, and will be able to differentiate products. Lastovicka and Gardner maintain that "the low involvement consumer not only thinks of the product class as trivial but he further has little bond to his brand change".⁸ They go on to say that, from a low involved information processing viewpoint, there is little perceived brand difference and uncertainty.

A second area of involvement is enduring product involvement which is more long term. Most people will be more involved in one or two product categories on a long term basis. There is general agreement in the literature on what enduring involvement is, but with the exception of Bloch, very little work has been carried out in this area.⁹ Most

The Author

Katriona Lawlor lectures in advertising and marketing communications at the College of Marketing and Design, Dublin Institute of Technology. She spent a number of years working as an account executive with a large Dublin advertising agency. She has completed a number of studies on the theory and practice of advertising and is currently working on a doctoral thesis.

involvement studies have concentrated on involvement with some aspect of the purchase. Again we may quote Bloch. "When consumer behaviourists talk about high involvement products they are more than likely referring to the tendency for high situational involvement to occur among the preponderance of individuals during the purchase of such projects due to a high degree of associated risks".¹⁰ Involvement with a product, however, is not purchase dependent. High involvement at the time of purchase is not the same as enduring involvement. A consumer may only experience high enduring involvement for one or two product classes. Enduring involvement is likely to be experienced by product enthusiasts such as wine connoisseurs or car enthusiasts. Definitions of enduring involvement include an element of ego involvement. "This is an inner state of the individual that reflects a long term product interest or attachment".¹¹ This is similarly defined by Mitchell as: "The more the issue or object becomes integrated with the individual's values the higher the level of involvement".¹²

A third area of involvement is situation involvement which includes both task and purchase involvement. "Situational involvement refers essentially to the ability of a situation to elicit from individuals, concern for their behaviour in that situation".¹³ Situational involvement is determined by the economic and time costs involved in purchase and by the amount of social risk involved as a consequence of purchase. Stanton and Bonner call for "a clear delineation between the purchase situation and the consumption situation".¹⁴ Both situations require different measurement variables. Thus purchase involvement is interrelated both with task involvement and whether the individual is trying to satisfy an immediate need or some more enduring motive. This was recognised by Clarke and Belk who introduced the concept of task involvement; "The task may be highly involving either because it entails important immediate goals (e.g. find a coat which is the least expensive brown wool coat in town) or because the intended usage situation involves important goals (e.g. find a dress to wear to the prom)".¹⁵

The final issue in relation to definition is whether involvement is defined as a state or a process. By definition a state is an existing condition or position, whereas a process is a course of action. There is an important difference between both. A state is static and can be measured with or without purchase. A process is dynamic, and will vary over time, and in the case of involvement will include more variables than the state definition. The state definition belongs in social psychology, where an individual's initial position is what is evaluated. The process definition however is rooted in cognitive response theory, which focuses on how individuals process thoughts; do they, for example, counter argue or support the message? Theories based on state models are concerned with antecedent conditions. Theories based on process models are concerned with how the stimulus affects the individual at the time of exposure to the ad or situation.¹⁶ Due to the proliferation of involvement research and conceptualisations, a mini conference on involvement was held at New York University in June 1982 and a generic definition was proposed. "Involvement is a state of motivation, arousal or interest. It is driven by current external variables (the situation; the product; the communications) and past internal variables (enduring; ego; central values). Its consequents are types of searching, processing and decision making".¹⁷

Personality Involvement

Kassarjian's theory on involvement is concerned with the interaction of product involvement and individual or personality characteristics. "It is undeniable that independent of the product class, there are some persons that tend to be more involved in the consumer decision process".¹⁸ At issue here is the existence of a generalised personality type.

Kassarjian postulates that alongside such personality traits as ambitiousness and sociability lies another personality trait — involvement in the purchasing process. So, just as some people are sociable by nature, others tend by nature to be involved in matters

related to purchasing. A particular consumer may have an interest in wine — product involvement. Another consumer may be a true wine connoisseur — enduring product involvement. Yet another may be interested in wine purely because the boss is coming to dinner — situational involvement. But over and above these three different forms of involvement is Kassarian's generalised involvement trait where a consumer is interested in wine because he/she is the type of personality who gets involved in purchasing things in general.

Kassarian introduces a threefold personality classification: a high involvement individual, a low involvement individual "detached type" and a low involvement "know-nothing". While Kassarian describes the interaction effect between these personality types and product involvement he does not suggest how either involved personality types or product involvement should be measured. Nor does he clearly specify whether product involvement is dependent on a particular type of behaviour. For example, does a person seek out information and visit numerous shops and possess a narrow latitude of acceptance every time he/she is highly involved with a product? The research in this paper is based on the assumption that product involvement does cause behaviour. In Kassarian's matrix (see Figure 1) the high involvement personality type in a high involved product situation is described as being interested in the product, willing to search out information, reads consumer reports, pays greater attention to advertising, and remains involved with the product after purchase. In a low involvement situation the high involvement personality type is described as typical of low involvement research, where the individual is not concerned with cognitive processes. There are two categories of non-involved consumers, the low involvement detached type who is generally unconcerned about products but will occasionally be extremely interested in a product in a high involvement situation. After purchase they lose interest. The second category in the non-involved category of individuals is the low involved know-nothings who never become involved with a product or situation. In a high involvement situation they make decisions according to price, or packaging, and in a low involvement situation they simply don't know or don't care what happens.¹⁹

Figure 1
Classification of Involvement

		Situation Effect or Product Involvement	
		High	Low
Individual or Personality Factors	High Involvement	<i>Much of consumer knowledge as it exists today</i>	<i>Typical low involvement research</i>
	Low Involvement "Detached Type"	<i>Minimal interest but narrowly and intensely focused</i>	<i>Oblivious to product issues. Other interests</i>
	Low Involvement "Know-Nothing"	<i>Choice determined by: availability, packaging, affordability</i>	<i>Don't know. Don't care and No opinion</i>

Source: H. Kassarian, "Low involvement — a second look", in Jerry W. Olson, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 8, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1980, p. 32.

Advertising Involvement

In his original definition describing ways of experiencing and being influenced by the mass media, Krugman describes involvement as "the number of conscious 'bridging experiences', connections, or personal references per minute that the viewer makes between his own life and the stimulus. This may vary from none to many".²⁰ Krugman is concerned with the different influences that the various media have on the individual. He defines television as having a passive effect on viewers; that is, people do not consciously evaluate ads on television. He defines print as having an active effect on viewers, where people consciously evaluate.²¹ Wright feels that rather than attribute this effect to the medium, two variables must be considered separately: "arousal to process, and opportunity to process".²² Arousal relates to an individual's interest in the content of a message and "recognition that the information has goal-satisfaction value".²³ Opportunity refers to natural characteristics of the medium and the facility for an active response. Television is temporal and there is little opportunity for reference. Preston, like Wright, feels that the type of ads in each medium has a greater effect than the medium itself. It is a "question of content rather than form".²⁴

The early hierarchy of effects models almost assume that as soon as a person comprehends something, he/she will like it, and therefore may purchase.^{25,26,27} Learning the message content is the central route to persuasion, and as consumers learn and comprehend, attitudes can be changed. These early models do not really consider the role of the individual in processing information; they also assume that the individual is active in processing information. Involvement in both consumer behaviour and advertising has focused on the cognitive. Recent theory, particularly in advertising, tends to concentrate on the affective. "The term 'affect' is normally used to encompass all emotions, moods, feelings, and drives".²⁸ Affect is concerned with how a stimulus affects us and not with some objective evaluation of the stimulus.

The original work on advertising involvement was with the effect of the medium on the individual. More recently studies have examined involvement in advertising and the ad itself. Emerging from these studies is the relationship between processing these ads and classical conditioning. That is, evaluation of beliefs may not be important and, under low involvement and affective involvement, the visual and other peripheral cues such as music, may be the major factors in determining attitude to the ad which in turn affects attitude to the brand. Krugman,²⁹ Zajonc and Markus,³⁰ and Ray and Batra,³¹ among others, question the assumption that individuals process ads simply on the basis of attributes which can form or change beliefs. Instead they may be affectively involved with the ad itself. The ad triggers a liking response, which can then be associated with some part of the ad, and/or may be associated with the brand advertised.

Research Methodology

The methodology that is used to determine either consumer or advertising involvement depends on whether one considers involvement a state or a process. The state definition belongs in social psychology; theories based on state models are concerned with antecedent conditions such as product and ego involvement. The process definition however is rooted in cognitive response theory, which focuses on how individuals process thoughts.³² Theories based on process models are concerned with how the stimulus affects the individual at the time of exposure to the ad or situation. This research adopts such a process perspective.

Very few of the studies on involvement have taken into account how individual differences explain differences in involvement. Yet as is obvious from information processing theory, individual differences can explain differences in behaviour. Kassarian, as described above, suggests a classification of involvement based on individual personality factors, the high involved, the low involved "detached" and the low involved "know-nothings". He also wished to ascertain whether the interaction of

personality involvement with a product or situation determines consumer response. Figure 1 considers the relationship between personality involvement factors and situation or product involvement.³³ To the writer's knowledge this six matrix personality classification system has not been tested before. Thus the main objective of the research was to cross tabulate each of the personality factors, i.e. high involvement, low involvement/detached and low involvement/know-nothing, with responses to advertisements to see if high involvement personality produced counter arguments in a high involvement situation and low involvement detached personalities showed little interest in advertisements in a high involvement situation. Given that Kassarian's final group the 'don't knows' and 'don't cares' are rarely found in research, as they tend to ignore questionnaires and refuse to partake in any form of research, it was not expected that this group would be found in the present study.³⁴

Kassarian's matrix of involvement (Figure 1) can be measured in two ways.³⁵ While it is generally agreed that involvement stems from consumer decision making which is involving, researchers also refer to product categories as having high or low involvement.³⁶ If one takes the viewpoint that there are high and low involving product categories then it is not necessary to measure product involvement as such in the Kassarian matrix — measurement can be concerned with personality factors which is the approach taken in this research. A major appliance such as a fridge or washing machine was chosen as a high involvement product and groceries as a low involvement product. An alternative measurement approach would be where every product from bread to cars might be classified as high and low involvement products depending on individual consumers. In this case both personality factors and product involvement would have to be measured.

Kassarian's personality classification of high and low involvement was tested by asking consumers to mark off statements that they felt matched the way in which they bought a major appliance such as a fridge or a washing machine. The following are examples of personality types for the high involved product. Extensive search, knowledge of brands and maintenance of product interest characterised the high involved personality type. Initial product interest with the product being forgotten about after purchase characterised the low involved detached personality type. Buying the cheapest product and not caring which brand was bought characterised the low involved know-nothing personality. For a low involved product respondents were asked to assume that they were buying a grocery product. The following are examples of personality type reaction in the low involvement situation. The high involved personality type in the low involved situation would be typified by conscientious shopping (only buys top quality and is price conscious). The low involved detached personality type would be typified by little interest in advertising and would not deliberately seek out brands. The low involved know-nothing personality type in the low involved situation would be typified by a lack of interest in brands and buy the cheapest.

Thought verbalisation methodology was used to determine advertising involvement. Thought verbalisation, or message evoked thoughts, has become popular in persuasion research. In a review of thought verbalisation studies, Wright concludes that "verbalised thoughts may be valid indicants of some audience processing activities".³⁷ Respondents were asked to describe what happened during any print advertisement on television which they had seen during the week in which they received the questionnaire. Respondents received the questionnaire at the beginning of the first week in June 1986. Respondents in this study could pick their own time periods to fill in a questionnaire, which could have been a few days after receiving the questionnaire or immediately they saw an ad. It was felt that this would remove researcher identity and respondents would thus express themselves more freely. These descriptive statements were then coded by using a system developed by Park and Young.³⁸ The codes were mutually exclusive. The codes were as follows: counter arguments which were any statements that disagreed

with statements expressed in the ad; source derogation statements were those that downgraded the source or aspects of the ad; support argument statements included source bolstering and whether respondents showed agreement and liking for the ad or brand. Examples of low involvement statements included a mention of brand name only and statements revealing no interest. Affective involvement thoughts were represented by aesthetic thoughts, perceived image, and thoughts referring to self image. It was expected that the interaction between personality and advertising involvement would imply that the high involvement type would be affectively involved with the ad, would counter argue and source derogate the ad; that the low involved detached would have a low involvement attitude to the ad, and would source derogate; and that the low involved know-nothings would have a low involvement attitude; and that there would be a moderate level of support arguing across all personalities.

Paint was chosen as a product because the researcher felt that it was the type of product that would reflect both high and low involvement. All of the major paint manufactures advertised during the first week of June. Respondents were free to choose whichever ad they wanted to describe. It is the researcher's opinion that some ads were affectively based such as the painting by numbers for *Crown* paint, the *Valspar* 'doll's house' ad, and the *Dulux* ad 'with the dog', although these did have cognitive or informational statements, while the *Berger* ads were predominantly cognitive. The results showed that there was no major difference in evaluation of ads. However, with respect to the *Berger* ads, less people were affectively involved and more people support argued.

At the time this research was conducted all affective responses were grouped into one response. Over the last few years a considerable amount of research has emerged on the affective area and in particular on emotion. The most popular methodology used to determine emotional responses is a response scale similar to one introduced by Wells, McConville and Leavitt.³⁹ These response scales represent a state of emotion; that is, whether or not an ad is happy. This is very different to a consumer response to an ad, for example, "the ad made me feel happy". The latter requires a process measure, and while the categorisation of responses in this study, particularly the affective area, is not as broad as it could be, both the cognitive and affective responses are measured by using a process methodology and not a mixutre of process and state.

The aspect of the overall study that is reported in this paper relates to a questionnaire conducted on the Attwood panel and will be referred to as the Attwood questionnaire in analysis of results. Attwood is a market research company providing consumer and market research on consumer panels. Out of a total sample of 1500, there were 948 replies, which is a postal return of 64%. Of the total number that replied, 66% represented the Rest of Ireland and 34% represented the Dublin Area. Households without children represented 40% of the Rest of Ireland and 38% of the Dublin Area. Households with children represented 60% of the Rest of Ireland and 62% of the Dublin Area.

RESULTS

Personality Categories

Kassarjian's personality classification suggests three categories of typical behaviour in the low involved situation and three in the high involved situation. Figure 2 gives the total counts for each personality category in each situation. There were more people in the high involved personality group/high involved situation than any other category. In the low involved situation distribution of households was more evenly spread among the three personality types. One could conclude from the findings in Figure 2 that it is possible to segment markets on the basis of involved personality type. With regard to purchase and use of paint one would expect the high involved personalities to differentiate between brands and to be a trade or experienced painter if paint was a high involvement product. This was not the case in that roughly 45% of each

personality category thought brand paints were similar and 57% of each category described themselves as inexperienced painters.

Figure 2
Personality Type Shopper

	Situation Effect or Product Involvement	
	High	Low
Personality Factors	High Involvement 418 / 188 66% / 59%	318 / 170 50% / 53%
	Low Involvement "Detached Type"	146 / 93 23% / 29% 182 / 88 29% / 28%
	Low Involvement "Know- Nothing"	67 / 36 11% / 11% 131 / 59 21% / 19%

Advertisement Assessment

Before examining advertising opinion codes in detail it is necessary to point out that 256 households or 40% in the Rest of Ireland and 114 households or 36% in the Dublin Area, did not reply to this descriptive question. The individual codes are evaluated on the total responding sample, and not the 60% responding to this particular question. This is quite a high percentage and may mean that thought verbalisation is confined to face to face interviews. Another reason for failure in response may be that respondents simply did not see the ads on television during the week in which they received the questionnaire. The introduction of remote control for television has meant that advertisers do not know if an audience is exposed to an ad; the above response could imply that forty percent were not. In the case of individual codes, only 1% on average of the households in all demographic categories in both the Rest of Ireland and the Dublin Area counter argued with the ad. This implied a lack of high involvement. Similar results were found for source derogation, where 3% in the Rest of Ireland and 1% in the Dublin Area derogated the source. Again there were no major demographic or regional variations. In fact, in all codes there was very little difference between the averages on all demographic and regional variables. The average for support argue was 20% in the Rest of Ireland and in the Dublin Area; the exception to this was 27% of the under 35's who support argued in the Rest of Ireland. The average for affective involvement or image identification was 14% in the Rest of Ireland and 16% in the Dublin Area. The average for those who were low involved was 21% in the Rest of Ireland and 25% in the Dublin Area, with no major differences demographically. Figure 3 shows the total opinion responses.

Personality and Advertising Opinion Codes

The main objective of this study was to examine the interaction between involved personality type and individual responses to the ads evaluated. This interaction can be achieved by cross tabulating type of shopper with advertising codes (Figure 4). On the whole respondents did not consider that the ads were high involving, as there was very little counter arguing or source derogating. There was no difference between personality types in the high involved situation or the low involved situation. Of those who support argued in the low involving situation, 31% were the high involved personality type; 34% were the low involved

Figure 3
Advertising Opinion Codes

	Rest of Ireland	Dublin Area
<i>Counter Argue</i>	8 1%	4 1%
<i>Source Derogation</i>	18 3%	3 1%
<i>Support Argue</i>	126 20%	63 20%
<i>Image Identification/ Affective Involvement</i>	86 14%	52 16%
<i>Low Involvement</i>	133 21%	81 25%

detached; and 35% were the low involved know-nothings. Of those who affectively evaluated the ad, 23% were high involved, 23% were low involved detached and 30% were low involved know-nothings. The biggest percentage of each of the personality types described the ad in a low involving manner: 39% of the high involved in the low involved situation described the ad with a low involving statement; 37% of the low involvement detached used a low involving statement; and 31% of the low involved know-nothings used a low involving statement. It was expected that the low involved know-nothings would have formed a greater percentage of the low involved statements.

Figure 4
Personality Type and Advertising Opinions

	<i>Counter Argue</i>	<i>Source Derogate</i>	<i>Support Argue</i>	<i>Affective Involvement</i>	<i>Low Involvement</i>
LOW INVOLVED SITUATION					
High Involvement	7 2%	12 4%	99 31%	71 23%	121 39%
Low Involvement "Detached Type"	4 2%	6 3%	61 34%	42 23%	66 37%
Low Involvement "Know-Nothing"	1 1%	3 4%	29 35%	25 30%	26 31%
HIGH INVOLVED SITUATION					
High Involvement	10 3%	15 4%	124 32%	88 22%	149 38%
Low Involvement "Detached Type"	2 1%	5 3%	60 37%	39 24%	55 34%
Low Involvement "Know-Nothing"	0 0%	1 4%	5 19%	11 41%	10 21%

What was interesting was that in answering the descriptive question, a percentage of the people who bought a paint or who were high involved shoppers did not answer this question. The percentages rose considerably from the high involved to the low involved know-nothings. For example, of those who did not answer the descriptive question in the low involved situation, 36% were conscientious or high involved people, 33% were unconscientious or low involved detached and 56% were cheapest buyers or low involved know-nothings. In the high involved situation the same percentages held for the high involved and the low involved detached, but the low involved know-nothings increased to 74%. This means that the less involved the personality type, the less likely they will complete a descriptive evaluation in comparison with other personality types.

Discussion of Results

This section discusses conclusions in relation to involved consumers and advertising involvement. Personality factors could not explain differences in advertising involvement. Roughly the same percentage in each personality type group evaluated the ads in similar involvement manners. For example 32% of high involved personalities support argued, and so did 32% of the low involved personalities, (the low involved detached and the low involved know-nothings).

The first conclusion is that the high involved personality type has a moderate level of affective involvement. It was expected that more people in the high involved group would be affectively involved. This was not the case; in fact a larger percentage of the low involved know-nothings were affectively involved. However, in terms of total counts it was a much smaller number. The literature suggests that affective involvement is more attributed to high involved people,⁴⁰ because these people are so experienced with a product they like it and the same for the ad. One possible explanation for the percentage of low involved know-nothings who were affectively involved, is that these people found that the easiest way to describe the ad was with a favourable, short story type response, indicating attraction. It could also be that respondents like the dog in the paint ad but did not have any interest in paint. Research to date has not concentrated on the affective side of involvement and further research may show whether the above findings indicate that the low involved know-nothings are just as likely to be affectively involved as the high and low involved detached.

The second conclusion is that high involved people do not source derogate even though there are low levels of counter arguing. It was expected that more high involved people would counter argue or source derogate. This was not the case. Wright found that the more involved women were with the content, the higher the corresponding level of counter arguing.⁴¹ There was however only a slight amount of counter arguing in this study. Wright also found that low involvement with content produced more source derogation and that maximum source derogation occurred under conditions where counter arguing was minimal.⁴² It was decided to see if this was the case, and it was not. The reason for this is that the ads are processed in a low involving affective state, although there is little counter arguing. Instead of source derogating, affective statements are made. In previous studies the main focus of attention centres around Wright's classification of responses such as counter arguing, support arguing and source derogation. Previous studies however, do not consider that there is another type of response due, not to high or low involvement, but to affective involvement, and that is an affective response. It is now suggested that where there is a high level of source derogation in a low involving situation, there will be a low affective involvement level. The opposite is also true for a low involving situation. Where there is a high level of affective involvement, there will be a low level of source derogation, which is the case in this study. In the high involvement situation it is suggested that where there is a high level of counter arguing, there may be a moderate level of affective involvement with the ad.

Another reason for the high level of affective involvement is that the medium used is television, and if one considers the type of ads that are most popular, the *Dulux* dog ad and *Valspar* doll's house ad, it is easier to display controlled affective images through television. This may not be the case with the print medium. This leads to the conclusion that involvement may vary due to the nature of the medium and the processing capacities of the individual. Preston strongly believed in the nature of the medium and concentrated on arguing how it was the nature of the medium and not the processing capacities that caused the variation in involvement.⁴³ The conclusions in this study do not support this argument but suggest that the nature of the medium will particularly affect affective involvement.

The third conclusion is that the low involved detached have a low involvement attitude to the ad. It was expected that the low involved

detached would have a low involving attitude; one can conclude that this was correct in that a third of the percentage that fell into this category did have a low involved attitude. When one considers that 56% of this category did not answer the descriptive question, one wonders whether or not this 56% represents the real low involved detached, who may have had a low involved attitude. Further research is necessary to answer this question.

The fourth conclusion is that the low involved know-nothings do not clearly have a low involvement attitude to the ad. It was expected that the low involved know-nothings would not source derogate but would have no interest whatsoever in advertising and would merely make a comment such as "I have no interest in ads or advertising". One can conclude that the majority of low involved know-nothings did not have a low involving attitude to the ad. If one were to combine support arguing and affective involvement, the clear majority would fall into that category. It is suggested here that support argument is dependent on affective involvement and that where there is a moderate level of affective involvement there will be a moderate level of support argument.

The last conclusion relates to all personality types and support arguing. It was expected that for low involvement paint advertising there would be a moderate level of support arguing across all personality types. Wright found no evidence of involvement affecting the level of support arguing.⁴⁴ This was also the case with this study, except for the low involved know-nothings in the high involved situation, where the level of support arguing dropped considerably compared to the other personality types. The reason for this was that there was an increase in affective involvement, which would indicate that if there is a high level of affective involvement there will be a low level of support arguing.

However the personality classification was very evident among those who did not answer the descriptive ad evaluation question. The issue is how useful is the personality classification in reflecting advertising involvement. The answer is that personality types are undifferentiated in ad evaluation and differentiated in those who are unprepared to answer this type of question. Kassarian suggested that it would be difficult to get the low involved know-nothings to answer typical research questions.⁴⁵ However if Kassarian's classification is to be useful in advertising or consumer involvement then it must be possible to measure the personality types and from an advertising perspective these different personality types must process ads differently. Otherwise there is little point in using this classification.

References:

1. M. Ray, "Marketing communication and the hierarchy of effects", in P. Clarke, ed., *New Models For Mass Communication Research*, Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, vol. 2, 1973, pp. 147-176.
2. H. Kassarian, "Low involvement — a second look", in Jerry Olson, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 8, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1980, pp. 31-34.
3. M. Rothschild, "Consumer involvement profiles: a new practical approach to consumer involvement", *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 25, 1984, pp. 45-58.
4. J.A. Howard and J.N. Sheth, *The Theory of Buyer Behaviour*, New York, Wiley, 1969.
5. M. Rothschild, and M. Houston, "The consumer involvement matrix; some preliminary findings", in B. Greenberg and D. Bellenger, eds., *Contemporary Marketing Thought*, Chicago, American Marketing Association, 1977, pp. 95-98.
6. R. Arora, "Consumer involvement; what it offers to advertising strategy", *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 4, 1985, pp. 119-120.
7. P. Bloch, "Involvement beyond the purchase process: conceptual issues and empirical investigation" in Keith Monroe, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 9, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1981, pp. 413-415.

8. J. Lastovicka, and D. Gardner, "Components of involvement", in J.C. Maloney and B. Silverman, eds., *Attitude Research Plays For High Stakes*, Chicago, American Marketing Association, 1979, pp. 67-74.
9. P. Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 413.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 413.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 415.
12. A Mitchell, "Involvement: a potentially important mediator of consumer behaviour" in William L. Wilkie, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 6, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1979, pp. 191-196.
13. T.L. Parkinson, and C. Turner Schenk, "An empirical investigation of the s-o-r paradigm of consumer involvement", in Jerry Olson, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 7, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1980, pp. 696-699.
14. J.L. Stanton, and P.G. Bonner, "An investigation of the differential impact of purchase situation on levels of consumer choice behaviour", in Jerry Olson ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 7, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1980.
15. D. Clarke, and R. Belk, "The effects of product involvement and task definition on anticipated consumer effort", in Keith Hunt, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 6, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1978, pp. 313.
16. A. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 194.
17. M.L. Rothschild, "Perspectives on involvement: current problems and future directions", in Thomas Kinnear, ed., *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 11, Ann Arbor, Mich., Association for Consumer Research, 1983, pp. 216-217.
18. H. Kassarian, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
20. H.E. Krugman, "The impact of television advertising: learning without involvement". *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 29, pp. 349-356.
21. H. Krugman, *op. cit.*, p. 354.
22. P. Wright, "Analysing media effects on advertising responses", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 38, 1974, pp. 192-205.
23. P. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 195.
24. I. Preston, "A reinterpretation of the meaning of involvement in Krugman's models of advertising communication", *Journalism Quarterly*, vol. 47, 1970, pp. 287-295.
25. E.K. Strong, *The Psychology of Selling* New York, McGraw Hill, 1925.
26. R. Colley, *Defining Advertising Goals for Measured Advertising Results*, New York, Association of National Advertisers, 1961.
27. R.J. Lavidge, and G.A. Steiner, "A model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness", *Journal of Marketing*, October 1961.
28. R. Batra, and M. Ray, "Affective responses mediating acceptance of advertising", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 13, 1986, pp. 234-249.
29. H.E. Krugman, *op. cit.*, pp. 349-356.
30. R. Zajonc, and H. Markus, "Affective and cognitive factors in preferences", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 9, Sept. 1982, pp. 123-131.
31. R. Batra, and M. Ray, "Advertising situations: the implications of differential involvement and accompanying affect responses", in R. Harris, ed., *Information Processing in Advertising Research*, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983, pp. 127-147.
32. A. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, p. 194.
33. H. Kassarian, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
37. P. Wright, "Message evoked thoughts: persuasion research using thought verbalisations", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 7, Sept. 1980, pp. 151-175.
38. C.W. Park and M. Young, "Consumer response to television commercials: the impact of involvement and background music on brand attitude formation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 23 Feb. 1986, pp. 11-24.
39. W.D. Wells, C. Leavitt, and M. McConville, "A reaction profile for TV commercials", *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 11, 1973, pp. 11-17.
40. R. Batra and M. Ray, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-147.
41. P. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 201.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
43. I. Preston, *op. cit.*, p. 287-295.
44. P. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 201.
45. H. Kassarian, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-34.